

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-30 are appending in this application. Claim 35 is canceled by the present response without prejudice. Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, which rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 35. Claim 26-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 26-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,764,736 to Shachar et al., (“Shachar”) in view of U.S. patent 6,512,525 to Capps et al., (“Capps”).

Initially, applicant and applicant’s representative wish to thank Examiner Strange for the interview granted Applicant’s representative on January 30, 2007. During the interview the outstanding rejections were discussed in detail. Further, during the interview claim amendments to clarify the claim features over the outstanding rejections were also discussed. The present response sets forth such discussed claim amendments and comments presented as to how the amended claims distinguish over the applied art. During the interview Examiner Strange indicated he would further consider such amended claims when formally presented in a filed response.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 26-35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, that rejection is traverse by the present response.

Claims 26-34 are amended by the present response to clarify features recited thereon, and particularly those claims no longer reference “a predetermined information processing apparatus”.

Claim 28 is also amended as suggested in the Office Action.

The claim amendments are believed to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 26-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Shachar in view of Capps, that rejection is traverse by the present response.

The claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein.

The claims are directed to an information processing apparatus or method in which a receiver receives information transmitted by an information providing apparatus. That information includes a telephone number assigned to a line connected to a predetermined apparatus and a designation of a communication method defining a communication with the predetermined apparatus. As now clarified in the claims “the designation indicating whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus”. The claims also clarify utilizing that designation to establish a communication link with the predetermined apparatus. Specifically the claims further clarify that the communication controller or controlling operation “determines whether the designation indicates the WWW server, the FAX-information apparatus, the computer, and the telephone apparatus”. The claims also clarify that the connection in the second communication mode is made “with a protocol corresponding to the determined designation”.

The above-noted claim features are believed to be fully supported for example by Figures 6A and 6B in the present specification as one non-limiting example. Those figures 6A and 6B in the present specification clarify an operation such as in Step S16 in Figure 3B in the present specification in which a communication processing is carried out after it is determined that a telephone-number tag is described and received communication.

According to features clarified in the claims, a designation of a communication method can indicate several of different communications methods depending on whether the predetermined apparatus to communicate with is any one of a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus. Even more particularly, with

reference to Figure 6A in the present specification, in the claimed invention operations such as shown in steps S22-S24, S27-S30, and S33 are executed. Specifically, in steps S22-S25 and S27 it is determined whether the designation indicates the communication partner is a WWW server, a FAX-information apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus. If yes in any of those steps S22-S24 and S27, then the operation proceeds to a respective of steps S28-S30 and S33 in which an appropriate communication protocol is designated based on whether the designation indicates communication to a WWW server, a FAX apparatus, a computer, or a telephone apparatus.

The features clarified in the claims are believed to distinguish over the prior art.

The primary reference to Shachar notes a communication in which information received can indicate an alternative network address.¹ However, Shachar does not disclose or suggest the features clarified in the claims of the designation indicating whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of a “WWW server, a FAX information apparatus, a computer, and a telephone apparatus.” Further, Shachar does not disclose or suggest any operation such as shown for example in steps S21-S24, and S27, and S28-S30 and S33 in which the designation indicates communication in any of the WWW server, FAX apparatus, computer, or telephone apparatus, and then selects appropriate communication protocols based on whether the predetermined apparatus is any one of the WWW server, the FAX-information apparatus, the computer, or the telephone apparatus.

In Shachar the only information that appears to be transmitted is a network address.

In such ways the claims address are believed to distinguish over Shachar .

Moreover, no teachings in Capps are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies in Shachar .

¹ See for example Shachar at column 13, lines 16 *et seq.*

Application No. 08/978,490
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2006.

Thereby, the claims are as they are and are believed to be allowable over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed the issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)
SNS/rac/temp

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTYSNS\20\sl\203071\203071US-AF1.DOC